

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,003,280 to Pelaez et al. (Pelaez) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,006,508 to Bondy et al. (Bondy). The Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a comprehensive signaling node comprising a signaling interface adapted for transmitting and receiving signaling communications and a storage system configured to store a Media Gateway Controller (MGC) routine, to store a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) routine, to store a Session Border Controller (SBC) routine, to store a Push-To-Talk (PTT) routine, to store a H.323 routine, to store a Wide Area Network (WAN) compression routine, and to store a Communication Assistance for Law Enforcement (CALE) routine. The comprehensive signaling node also comprises a processing system in communication with the signaling interface and the storage system, with the processing system being configured to receive a signaling communication through the signaling interface, process the signaling communication with the MGC routine if appropriate, process the signaling communication with the SIP routine if appropriate, process the signaling communication with the SBC routine if appropriate, process the signaling communication with the PTT routine if appropriate, process the signaling communication with the H.323 routine if appropriate, process the signaling communication with the WAN compression routine if appropriate, or process the signaling communication with the CALE routine if appropriate.

In the Final Office Action (dated 07/09/2008), the Examiner asserts that “features upon which applicant relies on ‘multiple processing of routines on a single platform’ are not recited in the rejected claim(s).” The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Specifically, claim 1 recites a single comprehensive signaling node comprising a signaling interface, a storage system, and a processing system. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the processing system is configured to receive a signaling communication through the signaling interface and process the signaling communication with the MGC

routine, the SIP routine, the SBC routine, the PTT routine, the H.323 routine, the WAN compression routine, or the CALE routine if appropriate. In other words, the processing system located within the comprehensive signaling node (*a single platform*) processes the MGC, SIP, SBC, PTT, H.323, WAN compression, or CALE routines (*multiple processing of routines*).

Moreover, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner equates home subscriber server (HSS) 34 in Pelaez with the storage system of claim 1. (Final Office Action, pg. 2, line 17 – pg. 3, line 1.) The Examiner then asserts that HSS 34 is configured to store media gateway control function (MGCF) 36, a session initiation protocol, border gateway control function (BGCF) 28, a Push-to-Talk routine, and wire line network 52 compression routine. (Final Office Action, pg. 3, lines 1-6.) Moreover, the Examiner also equates multimedia resource function processor (MRFP) 30, call session control function (CSCF) 22, and multimedia resource function controller (MRFC) 32 in Pelaez with the processing system of claim 1. However, in Pelaez HSS 34, MRFP 30, MRFC 32, and CSCF 22 are all elements of IP multimedia subsystem 20, whereas in claim 1 a single comprehensive signaling node comprises a signaling interface, a storage system, and a processing system – where the comprehensive signaling node is part of an associated communication network. (Current App., pg. 8, lines 21-23.)

Additionally, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Pelaez, at column 3, lines 15-65 and Figure 1, discloses that the multimedia communication network services PTT. (Final Office Action, pg. 11, lines 10-12.) While Pelaez does list “PTT – Push-to-Talk” in a list of acronyms, Pelaez makes no other mention of PTT throughout the remainder of the specification. Simply listing the phrase “PTT – Push-to-Talk” does not mean that Pelaez discloses processing a signaling communication with a Push-To-Talk routine, as required by claim 1. Additionally, Bondy also fails to disclose Push-To-Talk.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant asserts that Pelaez and Bondy fail to teach all of the limitations of claim 1. Thus claim 1 is allowable and such indication is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 and, therefore, are respectfully considered allowable over the prior art of record for similar

reasons as discussed above. Additionally, the Applicant refrains from discussion of dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-21 in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin D. Robb/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Kevin D. Robb, Reg. No. 47,901
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Steven J. Funk
Sprint
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100